

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

**December 9, 2015** - 6:09 p.m.  
Londonderry High School  
295 Mammoth Road  
Londonderry, New Hampshire  
**(Rockingham County)**

**IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-05**  
**SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:**  
Joint Application of New England  
Power Company d/b/a National Grid  
and Public Service Company of  
New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource  
Energy for a Certificate of  
Site and Facility.  
*(Public Hearing of the  
Subcommittee members held pursuant  
to RSA 162-H:10, I-c, for a  
Presentation by Eversource Energy  
and National Grid, followed by a  
Question-and-Answer Session, and  
comments received from the public.)*

**PRESENT:**

**SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:**

F. Anne Ross, Esq.  
*(Presiding as Presiding Officer)*  
  
Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey  
Cmsr. Jeffrey Rose  
  
Dr. Richard Boisvert  
Michele Roberge  
Patricia Weathersby  
Roger Hawk

Public Utilities Commission  
  
Public Utilities Commission  
Dept. of Resources &  
Economic Development  
DCR-Div. of Historical Res.  
Dept. of Environmental Serv.  
Public Member  
Public Member

*Also Present:* Michael J. Iacopino, Esq. (Brennan Lenehan..)  
Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator

COURT REPORTER: *Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**ALSO NOTED AS PRESENT:**

**FOR THE APPLICANTS:**

**Reptg. Eversource Energy:** Barry Needleman, Esq.  
Adam Dumville, Esq.  
(McLane, Graf...)

**Reptg. National Grid:** Mark Rielly, Esq.

**COUNSEL FOR THE PUBLIC:** Christopher G. Aslin, Esq.  
Asst. Atty. General  
N.H. Department of Justice

**DEPT. OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (DES):** Collis Adams, Administrator  
Wetlands Bureau  
Dept. of Environmental Serv.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**I N D E X**

**PAGE NO.**

**PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANTS BY:**

Mr. Plante 10

***QUESTIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE/SEC COUNSEL BY:***

Presiding Officer Ross 15, 34, 35

Commissioner Bailey 17, 19, 29

Commissioner Rose 18, 39, 43

Ms. Weathersby 19, 28

Mr. Iacopino 21, 32, 35, 41

Ms. Roberge 30

**QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC AS SUBMITTED** 45  
*(Read by Presiding Officer Ross)*

**PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY:**

Mr. Barthelmes 49

**P R O C E E D I N G**

1  
2 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Good evening,  
3 ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to a public meeting of the  
4 New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee.

5 We have one docket for consideration on  
6 today's agenda, the Joint Application of New England Power  
7 Company, doing business as National Grid, and Public  
8 Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as  
9 Eversource Energy, for a Certificate of Site and Facility.  
10 This is Docket Number 2015-05.

11 Before turning to our agenda, I would  
12 like to ask the Subcommittee members to introduce  
13 themselves, and I will begin.

14 I'm Anne Ross. And, I'm Chairman of  
15 this Subcommittee.

16 MS. ROBERGE: Michelle Roberge. I'm  
17 with the Department of Environmental Services.

18 DR. BOISVERT: Richard Boisvert, with  
19 the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources.

20 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Kate Bailey, a  
21 Commissioner at the Public Utilities Commission.

22 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Good evening. Jeff  
23 Rose, Commissioner of the Department of Resources and  
24 Economic Development.

1 MS. WEATHERSBY: I'm Patricia  
2 Weathersby, a public member.

3 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And, I don't  
4 know whether we have any representatives of departments,  
5 if so, would you please introduce yourselves.

6 MR. ADAMS: Good evening. My name is  
7 Collis Adams. I'm here on behalf of the Department of  
8 Environmental Services, where I serve as the Wetlands  
9 Bureau Administrator, and I also oversee the Shoreland  
10 Protection Program.

11 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.  
12 And, Chris, would you like to introduce yourself.

13 MR. ASLIN: Good evening. I am Chris  
14 Aslin. I am an Assistant Attorney General, and I've been  
15 designated in this proceeding as Counsel for the Public.  
16 In that role, I represent the public's interest to review  
17 the Application, make comments, hire experts, *etcetera*.

18 Public Counsel is a resource for  
19 public -- members of the public, but I don't represent  
20 individual members of the public. So, I want to make that  
21 clear that, if an individual has an interest in the case,  
22 on a personal level, they're free to talk to me, I'm open  
23 to hearing their concerns and issues, but I can't  
24 represent you individually in a legal matter. I can only

1 represent the public as a whole.

2           So, if you have individualized issues,  
3 you should consider your own counsel. But, if you wish to  
4 communicate to Counsel for the Public your concerns, I'm  
5 very much open to hearing from you, and I will take all  
6 that into consideration as I represent the public interest  
7 in this proceeding.

8           Feel free to come see me afterwards if  
9 you have things to tell me. Thank you.

10           PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Any other  
11 agencies represented?

12           *[No verbal response]*

13           PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. This is  
14 the Joint Application of New England Power Company, doing  
15 business as National Grid, and Public Service Company of  
16 New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy, for a  
17 Certificate of Site and Facility.

18           On August 5th, 2015, New England Power  
19 Company and Public Service Company collectively filed a  
20 Joint Application for a Certificate of Site and Facility  
21 with the Site Evaluation Committee. The Application seeks  
22 the issuance of a Certificate of Site and Facility  
23 approving the siting, construction, and operation of a new  
24 345 kV electric transmission line, referred to as the

1 "Project".

2 The proposed transmission line will be  
3 constructed in an existing developed transmission line  
4 corridor between New England Power's Tewksbury 22A  
5 Substation in Tewksbury, Massachusetts, and PSNH's Scobie  
6 Pond 345 kV Substation in Londonderry, New Hampshire. The  
7 preexisting transmission line corridor traverses the towns  
8 of Pelham and Hudson, in Hillsborough County, and Windham  
9 and Londonderry, in Rockingham County.

10 On August 12th, 2015, the Committee  
11 designated a Subcommittee to review and address the  
12 Application in this docket. On September 1st, 2015,  
13 Attorney Christopher Aslin was designated to serve as  
14 Counsel for the Public in this docket.

15 On October 5th, the Subcommittee found  
16 that the Application was complete and accepted it. On  
17 August [October?] 8th, a Procedural Order was issued in  
18 this docket. In this Order, the Subcommittee ordered the  
19 Applicant to conduct public information sessions in  
20 Rockingham and Hillsborough Counties on October 29th and  
21 November 4th. The Subcommittee also scheduled a  
22 prehearing conference for December 3rd, 2015, and ordered  
23 potential intervenors to file motions to intervene by  
24 November 13th, 2015.

1                   On October 16th, 2015, the Applicant  
2                   supplemented the Application by filing the Shoreland  
3                   Impact Permit that was issued by the Department of  
4                   Environmental Services on October 1st, 2015.

5                   On October 29th and November 4th,  
6                   pursuant to the Subcommittee's Procedural Order, the  
7                   Applicant conducted public information sessions in  
8                   Rockingham and Hillsborough Counties.

9                   The Subcommittee received one Motion to  
10                  Intervene in this docket. That Motion was filed by  
11                  Margaret Huard on November 5th, 2015. Ms. Huard's Motion  
12                  to Intervene was granted on November 30, 2015.

13                  A prehearing conference in this docket  
14                  was held on December 3rd, 2015. As a result of the  
15                  prehearing conference, a procedural schedule issued. A  
16                  final adjudicative hearing is scheduled for June 2016.

17                  We are here today for a joint public  
18                  hearing in this docket. Under RSA 162-H:10, I-c, within  
19                  90 days after acceptance of an Application for a  
20                  Certificate, the Subcommittee is required to hold at least  
21                  one public hearing in each county in which the proposed  
22                  project is to be located. The public hearings are joint  
23                  hearings with representatives of the agencies that have  
24                  permitting or other regulatory authority over the subject

{SEC 2015-05} [Public Hearing of Subcommittee] {12-09-15}

1 matter, and are deemed to satisfy all initial requirements  
2 for public hearings under statutes requiring permits  
3 relative to environmental impact. The hearings are also  
4 joint hearings with the other state agencies and are  
5 conducted in lieu of all hearings otherwise required by  
6 any of the other state agencies.

7 Notice of this joint public hearing was  
8 served upon the public by publication in the New Hampshire  
9 Union Leader on November 16th, 2015.

10 In this docket we will proceed as  
11 follows: We will first hear a presentation by the  
12 Applicant. Following that presentation, Subcommittee  
13 members, agency representatives, and Committee Staff will  
14 have the opportunity to pose questions to the Applicant.  
15 Thereafter, the public will be permitted to pose questions  
16 to the Applicant. If you have a question for the  
17 Applicant, we ask that you please write your question down  
18 on a card, and hand it to Counsel for the Committee, Mike  
19 Iacopino, who is sitting to my right, or the Committee's  
20 Administrator, Pamela Monroe, who is down at the end, on  
21 the left. We will try to organize all the questions by  
22 subject matter and present them to the Applicant in an  
23 organized fashion.

24 Once we have asked all of the questions

1 that the public may have, we will then take public  
2 statements or comments on the Application. Please make  
3 your public statements as succinct as possible, and try  
4 not to be repetitive. You can sign up to make a public  
5 statement on the sheets provided at the door.

6 And, now, we will hear the presentation  
7 by the Applicant.

8 MR. PLANTE: Good evening, ladies and  
9 gentlemen, madam Chairman, members of the board of the  
10 Committee. My name is David Plante, and I'm the Manager  
11 of Transmission Projects for Eversource in New Hampshire.  
12 My colleague, Bryan Hudock, from National Grid, is with me  
13 here tonight, as well as several key members of our  
14 Project Team. We're here tonight to continue our  
15 discussion about the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project  
16 as part of our NH SEC process. As mentioned in the  
17 opening remarks, this is the second of two  
18 post-Application public hearings.

19 As part of this process, we'd like to  
20 reiterate our commitment to provide an open communications  
21 to the public regarding the details of our Project. We  
22 recognize the importance of public participation in  
23 projects of this nature and will continue to listen to and  
24 address your concerns and ideas.

1                   To ground everyone on what the Project  
2                   is and how it fits into the electric delivery system, this  
3                   is a transmission project, an electric transmission  
4                   project. On this diagram, there's an arrow pointing to  
5                   the three transmission towers, for lack of a better way to  
6                   describe what it looks like, I guess. We're not proposing  
7                   to build any towers that look like that.

8                   But, to the left of that diagram,  
9                   there's a series of icons that represent the various types  
10                  of electricity generation facilities, and these are  
11                  located at a variety of places throughout the region.  
12                  From these generators, then pump electricity into the  
13                  transmission system, where it's then transported over  
14                  great distances to population centers, where it is then  
15                  reduced in voltage at a substation or a series of  
16                  substations to a lower voltage, where it is passed along  
17                  to roadside distribution lines for eventual delivery to  
18                  your homes and businesses.

19                  Think of it as a superhighway of the  
20                  electric system. It has a few onramps, generating  
21                  stations, and a few offramps, transmission substations,  
22                  but moves large quantities of electric power.

23                  Why do we need this Project? The  
24                  ISO-New England, the Independent System Operator for New

1 England, the body that's responsible for planning the  
2 transmission system, has undertaken a study of the  
3 northern Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire area,  
4 which is the fastest growing demand in New England. And,  
5 they have identified several potential overloads to the  
6 transmission system at current and even prior to current  
7 load levels.

8 National Grid and Eversource have  
9 combined to develop a solution, which part of which is the  
10 Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, that will meet the  
11 demands that have been identified in this study.

12 So, what is MVRP? This is basically a,  
13 as the Chairman had already described, it's a 24 and a  
14 half mile long 345 kV transmission line between Tewksbury  
15 Substation, in Tewksbury, Massachusetts, owned by National  
16 Grid, and Scobie Pond Substation, in Londonderry, New  
17 Hampshire, owned by Eversource. Eighteen (18) miles of  
18 that line is in New Hampshire. And, you can see below the  
19 breakdown of mileages in each of the four towns in New  
20 Hampshire that are proposed for the line to be occupying.

21 As well, this Project represents a  
22 \$123 million capital investment between Eversource and  
23 National Grid; 82 million of that is in New Hampshire.  
24 And, we also have a breakdown per community of that

1 investment. We are proposing a 2016, late 2016  
2 construction start, followed by a late 2017 completion.

3 Benefits for this Project? MVRP will  
4 improve the reliability of the electric system in this  
5 region of New England, to address the issues that have  
6 been identified by ISO-New England, to meet the growing  
7 demands of the customers in this part of the region.

8 Other benefits of the Project include  
9 significant tax revenues that will be realized by the four  
10 communities proposing to host this Project, as well as a  
11 significant number of direct and indirect jobs that will  
12 be created by the Project.

13 Where are we today in the process? This  
14 slide represents the four major steps in the New Hampshire  
15 Site Evaluation process. In May of this year, we started  
16 at Step 1. That's where the Site Evaluation process  
17 started. Our Project Teams have been involved with this  
18 Project for in excess of two years to get to this point.  
19 So, we began with our pre-application public information  
20 sessions in May, where we held two of those.

21 Step 2: After we filed our Application  
22 in August, we followed that up with two post-Application  
23 public information meetings; one in October and one in  
24 early November.

1           And, we are today at Step 3, which is  
2           the joint SEC/agency public hearings, which have to be  
3           held within 90 days post-Application. So, we are in the  
4           second of two of those meetings.

5           Step 4: As mentioned earlier will be  
6           adjudicative hearings in June, followed by a decision by  
7           the Site Evaluation Committee hopefully sometime in the  
8           Summer of 2016.

9           And, lastly, we want to again emphasize  
10          our commitment to free and open communication, and call to  
11          your attention the website that the Project has. This is  
12          a website that addresses several projects that are part of  
13          the Greater Boston/Southern New Hampshire Study.  
14          Merrimack Valley Reliability Project has its own tab or  
15          slide within that website.

16          We also have a toll-free number. We  
17          have a dedicated team of outreach and community relations  
18          professionals who are at the ready to address and respond  
19          to any questions or concerns that you may bring up.

20                   Thank you very much.

21                   PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Any questions  
22                   from any members of the Subcommittee?

23                   *[No verbal response]*

24                   PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I have a

1 couple. I know you're in an existing right-of-way, but I  
2 believe there are some areas of the right-of-way that  
3 currently have trees on them and will need to be trimmed  
4 back. And, I wonder if you could explain sort of how much  
5 of the right-of-way is actually going to have to be  
6 widened, and perhaps in what areas?

7 MR. PLANTE: Sure. I'll take that. You  
8 know, basically, there are no areas of the right-of-way,  
9 from a real estate perspective, that require any widening.  
10 All of the easement rights are in place and have been in  
11 place for decades. However, essentially every section of  
12 the right-of-way will require some degree of vegetation  
13 management, be it a small amount of side trimming, which  
14 is basically on the more southerly portions of the  
15 Project, to a more significant tree-clearing effort, which  
16 would be taking place in the section of the Project  
17 basically between David Drive, in Hudson, moving up toward  
18 Wiley Hill Road, in Londonderry. This is about a 4-mile  
19 long piece of the Project, where we're proposing to clear  
20 approximately 80 to 85 feet of additional wooded area to  
21 create a -- to create space for our proposed Project.

22 The remaining 6 miles of the Project,  
23 from that point north towards Scobie Pond, will also  
24 require some tree removal, as our Project is proposing to

1 occupy a position in more or less the center of the  
2 existing corridor, however, that center has a narrow strip  
3 of trees that has never been removed. So, our Project  
4 would require removal of those trees as well.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I have another  
6 question.

7 Your new towers and support structures,  
8 can you indicate what height they will be, and how they  
9 compare with the heights of the existing support  
10 structures that are in the right-of-way?

11 MR. PLANTE: Sure. I can get that one,  
12 too.

13 In the existing right-of-way, our  
14 average structure heights for Londonderry and Hudson are  
15 approximately 78 to 79 feet above grade. And, the  
16 proposed structure heights are 86 to 90 feet. So,  
17 basically, you know, 8, 9, 10 feet higher than the average  
18 structure heights that are there now.

19 And, for the National Grid piece of the  
20 Project, which is David Drive, in Hudson, and south, the  
21 average heights, because there's a much greater variety of  
22 voltages in the National Grid part of the right-of-way  
23 there, their heights are averaging from 55, up to about  
24 80 feet, or -- yes, 55, up to about 80 feet. Our proposed

1 heights will be 75 to 80 and -- yes, 75 to 80. So,  
2 they're somewhat greater than the average -- there's a  
3 greater difference between proposed and average in that  
4 section of the right-of-way, because there is an existing,  
5 fairly short transmission line in that section.

6 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.  
7 Other Committee members?

8 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Can you talk a  
9 little bit about what mean by a "reliability project"? Do  
10 you have -- do you have to build this Project?

11 MR. HUDOCK: Sure, I'll take that one.

12 MR. PLANTE: I'll go to the backup.

13 MR. HUDOCK: So, I'll answer that  
14 question.

15 In terms of the need for the Project,  
16 this was identified in a study undertaken by the  
17 Independent System Operator of New England. And, what  
18 they do is evaluate the transmission system under current  
19 and projected load, and also to stress the system, in  
20 terms of analyzing the impacts if various components were  
21 to be taken out-of-service, whether they're lines or  
22 station components.

23 And, what they found was that, under  
24 certain conditions, at today's load levels, and in future

1 load levels, there are a number of potential overloads on  
2 the system, if certain of these contingencies were to take  
3 effect.

4 So, in terms of reliability, what this  
5 Project will do is to strengthen the system such that it  
6 will -- the overall solution will mitigate those effects  
7 of the contingencies so that they no longer cause  
8 potential overloads on the transmission system.

9 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Just a follow-up  
10 along those lines then.

11 Is there currently constraints within  
12 the system or risks within the system, if this Project  
13 were not to move forward?

14 MR. HUDOCK: So, as I said earlier, some  
15 of these contingencies take place at existing load levels.  
16 But I would say that it requires certain contingencies to  
17 take effect.

18 So, there is, I would say, a small risk  
19 there of issues happening the longer that this Project is  
20 not put in service. However, in terms of constraints, the  
21 system is maintained by the Independent System Operator to  
22 work around their existing system. And, so, the reason  
23 why we haven't seen any impacts, because they're  
24 constantly taking, you know, the system conditions into

1 account when managing the system such that they can  
2 minimize the risk of this happening.

3 MS. WEATHERSBY: Will this then allow  
4 more development in the area or is this more for the  
5 existing level of development?

6 MR. HUDOCK: So, the study takes into  
7 account a number of factors. Some of which is the load  
8 growth in the overall area. So, as was mentioned in the  
9 presentation, the overall demand on the system is some of  
10 the highest in the overall New England area, and has been  
11 growing.

12 Additionally, taking into account things  
13 such as generator retirements, that also potentially  
14 require the need for newer and different ways to move  
15 power from one area of the region to another.

16 And, so, in terms of enhancing the  
17 reliability of the system, it kind of ensures continued  
18 reliability for the entire area. I wouldn't necessarily  
19 look at it as a capacity issue, in terms of adding more  
20 capacity to the system, but more to enhance the  
21 reliability of the system.

22 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: So, the  
23 transmission system is interconnected throughout New  
24 England, correct?

1 MR. HUDOCK: That's correct.

2 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: So, improving the  
3 reliability here in New Hampshire will improve the  
4 reliability throughout New England, is that true?

5 MR. HUDOCK: Yes, that's correct. You  
6 know, the difference between an issue with the  
7 distribution system, which is going to be more localized,  
8 you imagine a tree falls on a wire at your house, it's  
9 going to affect a very small local area.

10 Transmission issues or outages are going  
11 to affect a much broader and potentially regional area  
12 when they happen, which is why it's important to ensure  
13 that we minimize that risk that they would not occur.

14 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: So, do New  
15 Hampshire ratepayers have to pay the whole bill?

16 MR. HUDOCK: No. Transmission upgrades  
17 are funded by all New England ratepayers through a line  
18 item on their bill.

19 The way that's calculated, it's a  
20 regional pool, where the costs of that pool are funded by  
21 state load levels. And, so, currently, New Hampshire  
22 residents pay 9 percent of the regional transmission pool.  
23 So, for this Project, they will be paying, you know,  
24 approximately 9 percent of the overall Project costs.

1 And, we calculated that for the typical New Hampshire  
2 residential customer, that factors into a difference on  
3 their bill of one to two dollars a year.

4 And, the other thing I would emphasize  
5 is that this funding would be regardless of where the  
6 Project is located. So, whether it was entirely in  
7 Massachusetts or entirely in New Hampshire or, you know,  
8 in Rhode Island, that same funding mechanism would still  
9 be in place for this Project.

10 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And, does the  
11 FERC, Federal Regulatory Commission, review that, those  
12 rates?

13 MR. PLANTE: I'm not sure how that  
14 works.

15 MR. HUDOCK: Yes. I'm not exactly sure.  
16 You know, I know that ISO-New England is related to the  
17 Federal Energy Regulatory Committee, FERC. But, in terms  
18 of exactly who sets the state rates, I would have to get  
19 back to you on that one.

20 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I'm pretty sure  
21 it's FERC.

22 MR. IACOPINO: I have a question. You  
23 mentioned "contingencies" on the system, and then you gave  
24 us an example of something that would harm the

1 distribution system, a tree falling on a distribution wire  
2 at your house.

3 Can you give us some examples of the  
4 contingencies that ISO is concerned about that might  
5 happen to cause problems on the transmission system?

6 MR. HUDOCK: So, generally,  
7 contingencies are revolving around elements of the system  
8 being out-of-service. And, so, those include elements of  
9 lines, individual towers, or, you know, components of a  
10 substation. And, so, they don't necessarily look at  
11 causes, in terms of how it would happen, but more modeling  
12 the fact that it does happen.

13 So, in general, they look through  
14 thousands and thousands of possible combinations of  
15 contingency cases to determine system weaknesses.

16 MR. IACOPINO: But it's not -- it's not  
17 the wire being down, when you're talking about the  
18 transmission system, generally?

19 MR. HUDOCK: Well, I wouldn't say --  
20 yes, generally, no. But they do model -- part of the  
21 modeling is having a line out-of-service. So, there could  
22 be a number of reasons for that. It could be that the  
23 line is out-of-service for a maintenance activity or other  
24 issue. But that is -- part of the modeling does include

1 the potential for a line being out-of-service, as far as  
2 modeling what impact that would have on the system.

3 MR. IACOPINO: I have a question about  
4 electric and magnetic fields. We know that they exist  
5 within these types of projects. And, we know that there's  
6 an existing corridor with existing lines. Will this  
7 Project increase the electric and magnetic fields along  
8 the route of this corridor?

9 MR. BAILEY: In some sections, the  
10 addition of a new transmission line will increase the  
11 levels of electric and magnetic fields to a small extent  
12 at the edge of the right-of-way.

13 However, because of the Project design,  
14 those are limited by two factors. One is that the  
15 proposed new line would be, in most locations, located  
16 towards the center of the right-of-way, giving it a  
17 greater distance from the edge of the right-of-way, and  
18 therefore having less of an influence than it would  
19 otherwise. And, second of all, that the electric and  
20 magnetic fields, not only from the new line, but from the  
21 existing lines, have a magnitude, as well as direction.  
22 And, when placed close together, and if the timing of the  
23 phasing of the line is optimized, can -- the magnetic  
24 fields and the electric fields from the lines can mutually

1 cancel one another. So, the closer they are together and  
2 the better the optimization, the lower the fields will be  
3 at the edge of the right-of-way.

4 MR. IACOPINO: So, if I understand then,  
5 generally, there will be some slight increase in the  
6 electric and magnetic fields?

7 MR. BAILEY: Yes. Today, the highest  
8 level at the edge of the right-of-way, if I recall, is  
9 about 28 milligauss, and that's before the Project. And,  
10 after the Project, that will decrease by about 5  
11 milligauss. So, in that location, where the fields are  
12 highest, the Project will result in a decrease in the  
13 magnetic field.

14 MR. IACOPINO: But there are places  
15 where there is an increase along the corridor?

16 MR. BAILEY: Yes. The increases are of  
17 the same magnitude as the decrease people saw before, on  
18 the order of, you know, a few milligauss, to maybe a  
19 dozen.

20 MR. IACOPINO: And, how can we be sure  
21 that those increases in the electric and magnetic fields  
22 won't have an impact on the health of -- health and safety  
23 of the people who either reside or use the power line  
24 corridors, live near the power line corridors?

1 MR. BAILEY: Well, scientists have been  
2 looking into this question for more than 30 years. One  
3 thing to recognize is that the Project will meet standards  
4 set by two international organizations. One standard is  
5 set by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing  
6 Radiation Protection, which is affiliated with the World  
7 Health Organization. Another organization is the  
8 International Committee for Electromagnetic Safety, that  
9 also has standards. And, the field levels on the  
10 right-of-way and at the edge of the right-of-way will be a  
11 very small fraction of their guidelines.

12 So, for instance, the 28 milligauss that  
13 I mentioned is a value at the edge of the right-of-way  
14 under the existing conditions, is very much smaller than  
15 the 2,000 milligauss or 9,040 milligauss recommendations  
16 set by these standards.

17 In addition, we've had decades of  
18 research conducted to determine whether exposure to  
19 electric and magnetic fields to people, animals, and other  
20 organisms have adverse biological effects or produce  
21 outright harm. Like everything else, we know that very  
22 high levels of electric and magnetic fields can produce  
23 stimulation effects. We know that, you know, if you press  
24 very gently against the table, there's no pain. But, if

1 you ram your hand into the table, it's painful. The same  
2 thing is true with electric and magnetic fields. At very  
3 high levels, there can be adverse stimulation of the  
4 nervous system. But the guidelines are set so that the  
5 exposures, even of workers at the electric utilities, who  
6 are in close vicinity to energized conductors at high  
7 voltages, that their exposures are multiple factors below  
8 the levels at which adverse biological effects might be  
9 expected.

10 In addition, there has been decades of  
11 research that have been looking at whether exposures at  
12 very low levels, such as we might have in our own homes  
13 from appliances or from wiring, might have some adverse  
14 effects. And, despite all the research, no health agency  
15 has determined that these exposures pose a health risk to  
16 the public.

17 MR. IACOPINO: The same question I asked  
18 you last night, about clusters, cancer clusters and things  
19 like that, does the scientific literature contain any  
20 indications of those sorts of phenomenon in the vicinity  
21 of high voltage wires like these?

22 MR. BAILEY: No -- well, the health  
23 departments investigate clusters of many types of health  
24 conditions. I know of no report by a public health agency

1 or a publication in a journal that has shown that there is  
2 a clustering of disease around transmission lines.

3 MR. IACOPINO: What about noise? Do  
4 these wires make noise?

5 MR. BAILEY: Transmission lines are  
6 designed to minimize the production of noise, and are  
7 quite quiet during fair weather conditions. In wet  
8 weather conditions, when there are hanging drops of  
9 moisture on the conductors, that drop of moisture can form  
10 a basis for the small discharge of energy we call  
11 "corona". And, under those circumstances, there can be a  
12 small crackling sound.

13 Generally, the same conditions that lead  
14 to this type of corona noise from the transmission line  
15 are also conditions that produce noise themselves. So,  
16 wind blowing through trees, rain and so on. And, so, the  
17 increased noise under foul weather conditions may well be  
18 screened by noise from the environmental factors  
19 themselves.

20 MR. IACOPINO: And, will the addition of  
21 this particular Project into this corridor increase that  
22 noise or decrease it?

23 MR. BAILEY: There will be a slight  
24 increase in the levels of audible noise, but these levels

1 are quite small. And, even under the foul weather  
2 conditions, at the highest levels, the audible noise  
3 levels are below the EPA guidelines.

4 MR. IACOPINO: And, it's my  
5 understanding that your company has prepared a report,  
6 based upon models that you've developed, for both  
7 electromagnetic fields, as well as noise. And, it's  
8 contained in the Application, is that correct?

9 MR. BAILEY: That's correct.

10 MS. WEATHERSBY: As a follow-up to the  
11 health question, the 2,000 milligauss standard, is that  
12 based on a certain distance from the lines or a certain  
13 duration of exposure? I'm thinking of an abutter to the  
14 line that is subject to it, you know, pretty much  
15 constantly.

16 MR. BAILEY: The standard is not  
17 based -- the standard is not set for transmission lines  
18 specifically. It's set for exposure to electric and  
19 magnetic fields from any source, whether it be a  
20 transmission line, distribution line, appliance, and so  
21 on. And, it is not time-limited.

22 So, the actual standard is a  
23 biologically-based standard. That the electric and  
24 magnetic fields will not induce a certain level of voltage

1 within tissues in the body. So, if you are below, let's  
2 say, 2,000 milligauss, you are guaranteed that the levels  
3 of electric fields produced within the body will comply  
4 with the standard.

5 You can go to much higher levels than  
6 2,000 milligauss, if you can show, through biological  
7 modeling, that you do not exceed this electric field  
8 within the body. But these standards have quite a bit of  
9 what we call a "safety" or "uncertainty" factor. So that  
10 any person in our environment that is exposed to a field  
11 is very unlikely to encounter an exposure that would  
12 exceed this 2,000 milligauss limit.

13 Offhand, the only kind of exposure that  
14 I know of that would possibly exceed that that the general  
15 public could encounter were some fields from hair dryers  
16 that we measure, which can go into, in a few cases, to a  
17 few thousands, or even the highest recorded is 15,000  
18 milligauss, which would exceed the standard.

19 But, other than that example, I don't  
20 know of any situation where that standard would be  
21 exceeded.

22 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: You mentioned  
23 that, in the location today, under the existing  
24 transmission lines, the highest EMF recording is 28 -- or,

1 will be 28 milligauss, but -- and that's because the  
2 magnitude offsets the existing milligauss. And, you said  
3 that, in other areas, the -- what's the term? It's not  
4 "milligauss", the EMF will increase slightly.

5 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: But is there any  
7 place along the route that's higher -- that will be higher  
8 than 28 milligauss when the new line is in service or is  
9 that the highest?

10 MR. BAILEY: Twenty-eight (28)  
11 milligauss is the value that was calculated for the  
12 existing transmission line as it is today, before the  
13 Project. And, that is the highest field level we  
14 calculated at the edge of the right-of-way.

15 After the Project, the field levels  
16 will, in that particular situation I quoted, will be  
17 reduced by 5 milligauss. And, all of the other levels at  
18 the edge of the right-of-way, before or after the Project,  
19 will be below that 28 milligauss level.

20 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. ROBERGE: When you -- can you hear  
22 me? When you speak about the levels along the route for  
23 EMFs, are you using a model to predict that? And, if so,  
24 can you speak to the accuracy of the model and just give

1 some background on that?

2 MR. BAILEY: Certainly. The way that  
3 electric and magnetic fields are calculated involves  
4 applying the laws of physics. And, if you take the  
5 position of the current-carrying wires, and you know the  
6 voltage applied to those wires, you know the current  
7 flowing through them, you know how the wires are arranged  
8 in space, one can calculate exactly through the laws of  
9 physics what the electric or magnetic field will be at  
10 locations around the transmission line or any source.

11 The model, the way that we do these  
12 calculations, we use a program that was developed by a  
13 division of the Department of Energy, that has been  
14 applied throughout the country, tested many times, and is  
15 specified by several states as the model to be used in  
16 calculating compliance with their standards.

17 Generally, these, for the input values,  
18 can be quite accurate. When we go out in the field and  
19 measure the electric or magnetic fields from a  
20 transmission line and compare them to calculations, except  
21 for variations due to the terrain not being flat or  
22 shielding by vegetation and so on, we find that there's  
23 quite a good agreement between the calculated and measured  
24 values.

1 MS. ROBERGE: And, would you say that  
2 these models are site-specific? Do they take into account  
3 the terrain of the area or the specifics related to this  
4 Project?

5 MR. BAILEY: Yes. The Project is  
6 divided -- the Project route is divided into sections in  
7 which the characteristics of the transmission lines  
8 differ. And, so, within those sections, for the length of  
9 those, each of those sections, the particular combination  
10 of transmission lines and the loading on those lines is  
11 stable. So that, when we do the calculations, they will  
12 apply to most of that entire section.

13 However, if you go five miles further,  
14 one way or another way down the line, the conditions may  
15 be different, in that the transmission lines that are on  
16 the right-of-way may not be the same. There may have been  
17 intervening lines which have added or joined the  
18 right-of-way, which affect the calculations, or that the  
19 loading on the lines may change from another section.

20 So, for that reason, we have, in our  
21 report, calculated the site-specific values for each of  
22 these sections of the right-of-way.

23 MR. IACOPINO: I have some environmental  
24 questions. We know that there are access areas to the

1 existing right-of-way, and I understand that there will be  
2 some additional permanent access areas to the  
3 right-of-way, once this Project, if it's allowed, is  
4 completed.

5 And, I'd like you to please address what  
6 impacts can be expected as a result of having those  
7 additional -- additional permanent access points to the  
8 right-of-way?

9 MS. TREFRY: Sherrie Trefry, with VHB,  
10 responding to that question. We do have some permanent  
11 proposed access ways within the National Grid portion of  
12 the Project, particularly in the area of the Pelham  
13 Substation, where that substation needs to be accessed for  
14 maintenance, as well as to access switching equipment.  
15 So, we've proposed permanent access in that area, which  
16 also includes four permanent wetland crossings in that  
17 area.

18 MR. IACOPINO: And, what's the impact on  
19 those wetlands or those crossings? And, how is it  
20 mitigated, if there is an impact?

21 MS. TREFRY: The impact for permanent  
22 area for the entire Project is 4,428 square feet, which  
23 includes structures and permanent crossings. I don't have  
24 the exact permanent crossing figures -- numbers to give

1 you at the moment.

2 We've proposed stone ford crossings in  
3 those locations at the recommendation of the Army Corps.  
4 They are recommending that in order to basically reinforce  
5 those wetland crossings, but still allow hydrology to  
6 continue to move through those wetland areas, as well as  
7 vegetation to grow up between the rocks. So, it still  
8 maintains a wetland-type function, and allows for travel.  
9 So, that's what we've proposed in those areas to minimize  
10 the impacts to the wetlands.

11 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Could you just  
12 describe what a "stone ford crossing" actually looks like?

13 MS. TREFRY: Yes. So, a stone ford  
14 crossing tries to mimic the existing topographic area.  
15 And, we put in stone, New Hampshire Fish & Game has asked  
16 us to put in round stone.

17 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. How big  
18 would the stone be?

19 MS. TREFRY: I don't know exactly how  
20 big the stone would be. New Hampshire Fish & Game will  
21 dictate to us exactly what they're looking for. I think  
22 it's going to be around 3- to 5-inch stone. They ask for  
23 smooth stone, in order for animals, such as turtles, to be  
24 able to easily move over the stone. And, National Grid

1 agreed to that.

2 MR. IACOPINO: And, last night, we heard  
3 some concern from some members of the public about I think  
4 it's the Robinson Pond area. Could you explain what  
5 impact, if any, that this Project will have on that pond  
6 and its tributaries?

7 MS. TREFRY: Yes. VHB looked at and  
8 evaluated all the wetlands and surface waters within the  
9 right-of-way, and calculated the impacts as a result of  
10 this Project. The majority of the impacts are temporary,  
11 related to construction aspects to get into the  
12 right-of-way and down the corridor.

13 The wetland impacts will be temporary,  
14 as I said. So, it shouldn't have an impact on the  
15 Robinson Pond watershed as a whole. Those areas will be  
16 restored.

17 We'll also have proposed sediment  
18 erosion controls that are depicted on the wetland  
19 permitting plans that will address water quality concerns,  
20 such as sedimentation during the construction process.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I have some  
22 questions just about construction and actually how it's  
23 staged and managed.

24 Assuming that this went to hearing in

1 June, and that there were some type of approval in the  
2 summertime, what would the construction activity be?  
3 Would it be one section at a time or would there be  
4 construction along the whole route? And, would there be  
5 heavy dirt-moving equipment? And, if so, what kind of  
6 schedule of operation?

7 I'm just trying to get a feel for how  
8 disruptive the actual construction might be on some of  
9 these local communities, who are, you know, abutters or  
10 people who are near the right-of-way.

11 MR. PLANTE: Yes. As far as  
12 construction sequencing is concerned, and how it affects  
13 the overall Project, transmission line construction, by  
14 its very nature, is a bit of a serial effort. You know,  
15 initially, we would need to engage in forestry activities  
16 to get the right-of-way cleared to allow the other  
17 construction activities then to take place.

18 So, that begins, and proceeds for, you  
19 know, a period of time, to create enough space for the  
20 subsequent activities to begin. Those activities include  
21 installation of all the erosion and sediment control  
22 measures that are part of our Application, would be,  
23 obviously, conditions of any approvals. And, following  
24 that is the installation of any specific construction

1 access improvements that could include some grading of  
2 existing access roads within the right-of-way.  
3 Installation of rock trap areas at intersections of our  
4 right-of-way with public roads, to ensure that we don't  
5 track mud and whatnot from the right-of-way onto the  
6 roads.

7           Then, once the accesses are established,  
8 we would begin with civil construction-type activities  
9 that would facilitate foundation installations, because  
10 there are some -- some structures on the Project will  
11 require foundations. The great many of the structures are  
12 actually directly embedded pole-type structures. They  
13 don't really require a foundation, *per se*. But they do  
14 require civil construction activities to establish the  
15 hole and prepare for structure installation.

16           So, that activity begins, and then  
17 follows the forestry, which follow the construction access  
18 and erosion control stuff. And, then, following that is  
19 the onset of actual line construction activity, which  
20 would involve mobilizing of the materials to each  
21 construction site. So, each, in our Application, the  
22 construction plans show work areas for each construction  
23 site.

24           So, we first mobilize our material to

1 those sites, a small crew complement of line workers would  
2 then engage in any pre-erection framing of the materials  
3 on the ground, to make sure that they can maximize the  
4 on-the-ground work, because it's much more efficient than  
5 doing certain activities in the air.

6 So, that crew then passes along,  
7 followed by the structure erection crew, which actually  
8 goes pretty quick, once all the ground work is done, so  
9 they would erect the structure, backfill it, and then  
10 engage in whatever restoration activities would be  
11 required at that structure location. Get it graded,  
12 loamed, seeded, mulched, to make sure that we can  
13 establish -- reestablish growth as quickly as possible.

14 And, then, lastly, the wire installation  
15 process follows that. And, wire installation requires  
16 longer segments of the Project to actually have structures  
17 installed before you start your wire work. Because wire  
18 runs generally are in -- measured in miles, rather than  
19 each structure. So, the wire is last, by its nature, and  
20 generally doesn't take quite as long, because it goes in  
21 such large chunks.

22 Once the wire installation is done, we  
23 engage in the demobilization activities in the  
24 right-of-way, restoration and whatnot.

1                   So, it's likely that large portions of  
2 the Project length will be engaged in construction  
3 activities at once.

4                   PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And, roughly  
5 how long would construction take?

6                   MR. PLANTE: We're envisioning an  
7 overall construction timeframe of about a year. We figure  
8 we'd start forestry activities late 2016, and into the  
9 Winter of '17, and then follow that with all of our line  
10 construction activities. So, all portions of the  
11 right-of-way won't be engaged for year.

12                   COMMISSIONER ROSE: I was wondering if  
13 you could speak to your analysis on impacts to wildlife,  
14 if there's any endangered or threatened species along the  
15 corridor, and your review for any threatened or endangered  
16 plant life?

17                   MS. TREFRY: Sherrie Trefry, from VHB.  
18 We reviewed the Project with the Natural Heritage Bureau  
19 database, and came out with a number of rare plants and  
20 animal species. We met with the Natural Heritage Bureau,  
21 as well as New Hampshire Fish & Game, to establish  
22 protocols for surveys for certain species. And, we  
23 engaged in survey activities in the Summer of 2015, and  
24 will continue to survey into 2016.

1                   The species, animal species that we  
2 surveyed for included the black racer snake in the  
3 springtime. We did not locate any black racers when we  
4 went out there. So, Fish & Game has asked us to go out  
5 again in the Spring of 2016, which we will do. We did  
6 turtle nesting surveys to identify turtle nesting areas  
7 within the right-of-way. And, we will do pre-construction  
8 sweeps if the construction is occurring in those turtle  
9 nesting areas to avoid any impacts to turtle nests. We  
10 will also do New England cottontail surveys this winter,  
11 once the snow falls. That's the appropriate time to go  
12 out there.

13                   Last year, because of the depth of snow,  
14 it was impossible to do it last year. So, we'll do it  
15 this year, after the first snow, to identify whether the  
16 New England cottontail is present or not.

17                   And, we also did rare plant species  
18 surveys, and identified three different rare plants that  
19 occur within the right-of-way area. And, we've been  
20 working with the Natural Heritage Bureau, as well as New  
21 Hampshire Fish & Game, to come up with strategies to avoid  
22 those rare plant species. We've relocated structures,  
23 access ways, temporary work areas, to avoid any impacts to  
24 rare species. And, we'll continue to do surveys right up

1 through construction, and then have an environmental  
2 monitor present during construction to make sure we avoid  
3 any impacts to rare plants.

4 We also did a northern long-eared bat  
5 acoustic survey, because of suitable summer habitat to the  
6 northern long-eared bat. The results of our survey did  
7 not have any positive identification of any northern  
8 long-eared bat. We submitted that report to the U.S. Army  
9 Corps, who made a determination of no effects for the  
10 Project, and submitted that to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife  
11 Service for their concurrence, which they did concur. So,  
12 we do not expect any impacts to the northern long-eared  
13 bat.

14 MR. IACOPINO: I have a question about  
15 wildlife. Are some of the towers that you're going to use  
16 the lattice-style of towers? And, do they pose -- do  
17 those towers pose any issues for roosting or anything like  
18 that for any of the avian species you might find on this  
19 corridor?

20 MS. TREFRY: I don't, in terms of the  
21 structure --

22 MR. PLANTE: I'll talk about the  
23 structure, and then you can take the rest of it.

24 MS. TREFRY: Okay.

1 MR. PLANTE: None of the structures that  
2 are proposed for the Project are lattice-type structures.  
3 They're all round steel structures, basically, pole-type.

4 MR. IACOPINO: I assume that poses no  
5 roosting problems then?

6 MS. TREFRY: Correct.

7 MR. IACOPINO: Then, I'd just like to  
8 switch a little bit and talk about historic resources. In  
9 September, we received a report from the Division of  
10 Historic Resources indicating that all the Phase IA  
11 archaeological surveying had been completed, and I think  
12 it was about 40 percent of the Phase 1B testing was  
13 completed.

14 Has there been any progress on  
15 completing that Phase 1B since September?

16 MS. TREFRY: Sherrie Trefry. I am not  
17 the historical resources expert, but I can speak to the  
18 progress that has been made.

19 The consultant has completed the Phase  
20 1B survey, and did not identify any significant  
21 archeological resources. They submitted that report to  
22 the Division of Historical Resources for comment. And,  
23 we're still waiting for their response, in terms of their  
24 concurrence with that report.

1 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER ROSE: In the presentation,  
3 it was referenced that there would be increase in tax  
4 revenue to the host communities. And, I was wondering if  
5 you could quantify that?

6 MR. HUDOCK: We can quantify it. I  
7 think we had it up there on one of our slides. So, if you  
8 give me a second, I can --

9 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Oh, sorry. I may  
10 have missed it, because my back is to the slides.

11 MR. HUDOCK: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER ROSE: But I did catch that  
13 part, so --

14 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. I can either look it  
15 up for you, or I think we're also going to be providing  
16 this presentation electronically and making it available.  
17 Oh, it's right here in front of me.

18 So, what we're currently -- that's the  
19 current investment. So, you know, we will get those  
20 numbers, though. We do have the actual estimated tax  
21 revenues.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: We're just  
23 checking to see if we have any written questions from the  
24 public. If you have some, and you haven't handed them in,

1 please do so now.

2 MR. IACOPINO: Does anybody have any  
3 questions they wanted to ask of the audience that they  
4 have written down on a piece of paper? I will pick it up  
5 for you. Are you still writing?

6 FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

7 MR. IACOPINO: Yes. Anybody else?

8 (Short pause).

9 MR. PLANTE: I have an answer to your  
10 tax question.

11 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Please.

12 MR. PLANTE: Per our expert on economic  
13 studies, Lisa Shapiro, in her testimony, she notes that,  
14 in the first year of operation, the Project will pay  
15 approximately \$760,000 to \$1.1 million in total property  
16 taxes. And, this is broken down in the following  
17 categories: And, it's 491,000 and 796,000 to the two  
18 local communities, and this would be the -- this is just  
19 the Eversource piece at the moment, so that would be  
20 Londonderry and Hudson; 28,500 to 42,200 to the two  
21 counties; and 240 to 250 to the State for redistribution  
22 to local school districts through state aid. That's for  
23 the Eversource piece.

24 And, I'll find the -- you don't have

1 that in front of you? We'll see if we can find it before  
2 we're done today. If not, we'll have to get back to you.

3 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right. The  
4 first question is from David Barthelmes.

5 MR. BARTHELMES: Very good.

6 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I try.

7 During construction will abutters need  
8 to be available? And, will there be much lead time in  
9 finding out that the construction is going to be in your  
10 area?

11 MR. PLANTE: I would say that the  
12 abutters don't need to be available. I don't believe  
13 there's, in most cases, there's no need for our  
14 construction activities to venture onto or off of our  
15 right-of-way.

16 However, if there is a desire to have  
17 any specific amount of advance notice of the process and  
18 progress of our activity, we are absolutely more than  
19 happy to give you whatever information you want, in  
20 however far in advance is convenient for you.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And, there's a  
22 follow-up question. And, that is, what would the property  
23 value impact of the Project be?

24 MR. PLANTE: Okay. I don't think I can

1 take that. But I have Bob Varney here, who's -- there you  
2 go, Bob.

3 MR. VARNEY: Make a few statements here,  
4 stepping in. Thank you. For the record, my name is Bob  
5 Varney, from Normandeau Associates.

6 I prepared prefilled testimony on the  
7 issue of land-use and orderly development. And, in the  
8 course of preparing my report and testimony, I reviewed  
9 the report prepared by Dr. James Chalmers, who is an  
10 economist and licensed appraiser.

11 He prepared a report that is in the  
12 Application in Appendix AK, and provided detailed prefilled  
13 testimony, which concluded that there's no basis in the  
14 published literature or in the New Hampshire-specific  
15 research initiatives that are described in his report to  
16 expect that the Project would have a discernible effect on  
17 property values or marketing times for property for sale  
18 in local or regional real estate markets.

19 His report covered four topics in  
20 reaching his conclusion. He conducted a literature  
21 review, and reviewed approximately 25 related studies,  
22 looking specifically at the issue of transmission lines  
23 and their relationship to property values. He conducted  
24 New Hampshire case-specific studies, looking at

1 approximately 58 properties. He conducted subdivision  
2 studies, I believe about 13 or so subdivisions. And, as  
3 well as market activity research, which is looking at the  
4 MLS.

5 And, based on these four elements of  
6 review, he reached the conclusion that I just described.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.

8 This question is from Doug Thomas. How  
9 will the new SEC rules affect application -- the  
10 Application? And, will they be used during evaluation and  
11 Project --

12 MR. THOMAS: Adjudication process.

13 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Adjudication  
14 process. Sorry. I was having trouble with the writing.

15 MR. THOMAS: That's okay.

16 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.

17 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I'm sorry.

18 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Hi. I'm Barry  
19 Needleman, counsel for the Applicants, from McLane  
20 Middleton.

21 The short answer to that question is  
22 that the final rules have not yet been adopted. I think  
23 the expectation is that they will be sometime shortly.  
24 And, there is a provision in the revised statute that

1 contemplates what will happen if rules are adopted while  
2 projects are pending in front of the Committee at that  
3 time. And, it's our understanding that it will be up to  
4 the Committee, based on the statute, to determine whether  
5 or not those new rules apply when they're adopted.

6 MR. IACOPINO: Actually, I'm going to  
7 address that issue from the Committee's standpoint. Our  
8 view of the statute is that, once -- once new rules have  
9 come into effect, if this Project, or any other project,  
10 for that matter, has not yet advanced to an adjudicative  
11 hearing, it will be subject to the new rules. However, we  
12 do have to provide an opportunity for the Applicant to  
13 provide any information that might be -- might be required  
14 under the new rules that was not required under the old  
15 rules.

16 I don't know if there's anything like  
17 that in this particular case, whether this particular  
18 Project at this point would require such a delay in order  
19 to get the new information. That assessment hasn't been  
20 made yet. But that's our view of what the statute  
21 requires.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. That  
23 completes our written questions. We don't have any people  
24 indicating that they are interested in making comments.

1 But, before we close, I would invite people to make  
2 comments from the public, if you wish to?

3 I'm sorry. Go ahead.

4 MR. HUDOCK: If I may, I just wanted to  
5 report back on the question regarding the first year  
6 property tax estimates for the National Grid portion of  
7 the Project.

8 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.

9 MR. HUDOCK: This was included in our  
10 prefiled testimony from our in-house economist. But he  
11 estimated that, for the first year after construction,  
12 this Project would result in tax payments of \$571,700 for  
13 Pelham, New Hampshire, \$71,200 for Hudson, New Hampshire,  
14 and \$235,800 to Windham, New Hampshire.

15 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.

16 Were there any people wishing to comment?

17 Go ahead, sir. If you could just state  
18 your name, yes, and come to the mike.

19 MR. BARTHELMES: My name is David  
20 Barthelmes. I live at 10 Jason Drive. I'm one of the  
21 direct abutters.

22 I had a question about the date of the  
23 study about property impact. Because, obviously, since I  
24 learned about this, this is a subject that's near and dear

1 to my heart. And, I have found a lot of information that  
2 studies done before 2009 tended to use demographic areas  
3 where the median income or the median value of the  
4 property was significantly less than the average home  
5 value in Londonderry. So, I was just wondering if we  
6 could find out what towns were looked at, and what was the  
7 median income?

8 Because studies that I've looked at have  
9 indicated that homes in the 300,000 to 500,000 suffer as  
10 much as a 6 percent as a result of visible power lines.  
11 And, the issue comes down to "visible". Personally, for  
12 the record, I don't put much into this EMF. I'm an  
13 engineer and I've worked with this.

14 But perception is everything. So, I'd  
15 be very interested to know when was the study done? And,  
16 if you could get back to us here now, or at some point,  
17 that would be great.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I don't know if  
19 the Applicant is able to answer tonight, are you?

20 MR. VARNEY: Bob Varney, Normandeau  
21 Associates.

22 My recollection of Appendix AK is that  
23 the report was -- I have it in my car, actually, if you'd  
24 like to look at it after the meeting. It's, I believe,

1 June 30th, 2015, and covers the four elements that I  
2 described a few moments ago.

3 MR. BARTHELMES: And, does that have the  
4 towns? Will that list what towns were used as part of  
5 that study?

6 MR. VARNEY: The report explains his  
7 methodology for the four elements that he reviewed, as  
8 well as his conclusions about the fact that there are no  
9 discernible effects on local and regional property values  
10 and marketing times associated with the Project. There --  
11 associated with electric transmission lines.

12 There are site-specific situations that  
13 are associated with proximity and visibility. So, and  
14 there are multiple characteristics associated with each  
15 property, as you know, that come into play when you're  
16 considering property value and marketability of a  
17 property.

18 And, I would encourage you to read that  
19 report. Thank you.

20 MR. IACOPINO: You can find that report  
21 on the Site Evaluation Committee's website, which is  
22 [www.nhsec.nh.gov](http://www.nhsec.nh.gov). And, it's in the Application section  
23 for this Project. And, it's at Appendix AK, alpha-kilo.

24 MR. BARTHELMES: Thank you.

1                   PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you. Are  
2 there any other people who wish to make a comment tonight,  
3 before we close the hearing?

4                   *[No verbal response]*

5                   PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. And,  
6 just to follow up on what Attorney Iacopino just  
7 mentioned. The filing can be found on our website. And,  
8 this is a fairly transparent process. The transcript of  
9 tonight's hearing will also eventually be available, once  
10 it's completed, it will be available in electronic form on  
11 the website, as will the transcript of other public  
12 proceedings in the docket. So, feel free to access it on  
13 line.

14                   And, thank you very much for coming out  
15 tonight and for sharing your views.

16                   **(Whereupon the joint public information**  
17                   **session was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.)**